

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES
September 24, 2008

Chair Knox White called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:35 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL** – Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:

John Knox White
Michael Krueger
Robert McFarland
Eric Schatmeier

Members Absent:

Kathy Moehring (arrived 7:45 PM)
Srikant Subramaniam
Jane Lee

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer
Barry Bergman, Transportation Coordinator

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. July 23, 2008

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that the comment reading “What does this mean?” should be deleted from the final text of the minutes.

Commissioner Schatmeier moved approval of the minutes for the July 23, 2008, meeting and minutes as presented. *Commissioner McFarland* seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

3. **COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

Commissioner Schatmeier hoped a representative from AC Transit would be in attendance. He noted that last year, he took the ferry home from a Giants game, and had made the connection to the 63 bus, and then the 50 bus, each within five minutes of the connection. He added that he attended a Saturday afternoon Giants game, stayed in the City for dinner, and found that the ferry arrived at Alameda terminal at 10:15 p.m., and the bus left Alameda terminal at 10:14 p.m. He noted that four of nine ferry runs on weekends missed connections with AC Transit buses by one minute, and another bus arrives six minutes before the bus. He noted that the connections were very important to maintain multi-modalism, and that if the bus did not connect to the ferry, there was no point in running it into the parking lot. He would like to talk to AC Transit about those missed connections, and whether there was any flexibility in the ferry schedule.

Commissioner Krueger asked if there might also be flexibility in the ferry schedules.

Staff Bergman noted that he would look into both the weekend and weekday schedules.

Chair Knox White wished to discuss the multimodal thresholds of significance policies, and suggested that a scope of work be presented at the next meeting, which broke down the timelines and costs in order to bring something back for recommendation to the Planning Board by the end of the year. This should include examining issues that were not addressed in the Draft EIR for the TMP. He inquired whether the Transportation Commission concurred with his request.

Commissioner Moehring arrived at 7:45 p.m.

Commissioner Krueger agreed with *Chair Knox White's* comments and believed that further clarification would be beneficial.

Staff Khan noted that staff was working on that item diligently, and had brought forth the methods by which the threshold of significance can be calculated. Staff was also working with the City Attorney's office, City Manager's office and the Planning Department to find funding. He noted that it may be funded internally. He noted that the most significant concern was looking at the street function classification matrix, and providing implementation guidelines moving forward.

- a. Pedestrian Plan**
- b. Bicycle Plan Update Group**
- c. Alameda Point Advisory Task Force**

Chair Knox White noted that none of the meetings had been held since the last meeting. He noted that SunCal's preliminary development concept was submitted the previous Friday, and was available at www.alameda-point.com.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS

There were none.

7. NEW BUSINESS

- a. North of Lincoln Strategic Plan for the Park Street Business District**

Eric Fonstein, Development Manager, Development Services Department, noted that his department had worked closely with Doug Garrison of the Planning Department, as well as *Staff Khan* from Public Works. He presented the staff report, and detailed the

background of this item and the history of the City's development. He displayed a PowerPoint presentation on the overhead screen, and noted that this was one step of a multiphase plan.

Mr. Fonstein emphasized that the concepts could be applied as opportunities materialized, and that this plan did not force change. He noted that this presentation was brought before other boards and commissions, and comments were received which mentioned that new development should adequately address transportation concerns, provide TDM strategies and services, address the gaps between pedestrian/bicycle networks, take into account traffic level of service standards, and instead of considering one multilevel parking structure, that multiple smaller parking lots be considered. He noted that the plan would be brought before City Council on October 7, and that the Planning Department will amend the zoning regulations to ensure they are consistent with the direction and vision laid out in the plan.

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that the document discussed pedestrian-friendly practices, and transit-oriented development, but that there was no discussion of transit and the role of transit in supporting the proposed type of development. He noted that the Park Street corridor is well-served by transit, and this service has improved over the years. He asked that additional attention be paid to the supportive relationship and coordination needed between the land use type and transit service in the study area.

Commissioner Moehring agreed with *Commissioner Schatmeier's* comments, and noted that while the Transportation Element accommodated public parking, Park Street was more pedestrian-friendly but she would like to see a way to decrease the amount of driving needed to reach pedestrian-friendly sites. She would like to hear comments from Robb Ratto of the Park St. Business Association.

Commissioner Krueger agreed with the comments regarding transit, and noted that this would be especially important if Lincoln is selected as a route for Bus Rapid Transit, and this may be the point where people . He also recommended that the section on parking to be tied in with the ongoing parking study. He believed the parking standards will become even more important in the future because many of the Park Street businesses have been able to succeed with less parking than would be provided in a typical suburban setting.

Mr. Fonstein replied that the parking plan will be presented within the next few months.

Chair Knox White noted that he found the numbering to be confusing, as in each section the strategies reset to number 1. He was surprised to see how parking-heavy the plan was, given the goals of the plan. He suggested that in-lieu parking fees could be used for shuttle service or bicycle and pedestrian improvements, not just for parking at an alternative location. He noted that Vision 12 was meant to enliven the waterfront, but that the illustrative sketch seemed to hide the waterfront from view and surrounded it by a large parking lot. He agreed with the ultimate policies, but was concerned that transit was not discussed on Alameda's heaviest corridor. He would like staff to solicit comments not only from WABA and PSBA, but also from the bicycle, transit and

pedestrian stakeholder groups. He would like the parking policies to be examined more thoroughly before the plan went to the CIC. He also noted that on p. 16 screened parking was included, but that this was not consistent with what was being proposed; he asked whether this was intended to be only for the short-term. He suggested removing language associated with parking minimums and maximums, and instead indicate that the plan should be consistent with other policies, such as what would be ultimately recommended in the parking study.

Open public hearing.

There were no speakers.

Close public hearing.

<i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> moved to incorporate the comments made into the document. <i>Commissioner Krueger</i> seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0.
--

7B. Election of Transportation Commission Chair and Vice Chair

Staff Bergman noted that staff was unable to contact *Commissioners Lee and Subramaniam* regarding their interest in being appointed as chair or vice-chair.

Chair Knox White inquired whether the Transportation Commission would like to move forward with the election. The Commission concurred.

<i>Commissioner Moehring</i> moved to nominate <i>Chair Knox White</i> as Chair. <i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0.

Chair Knox White noted that since Mr. Ratto had stepped down, the Vice-Chair position was vacant.

<i>Commissioner McFarland</i> moved to nominate <i>Commissioner Krueger</i> as Vice-Chair. <i>Commissioner ____</i> seconded the motion. Motion passed 5-0.

8. **STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

a. **Estuary Crossing**

Staff Khan noted that the Estuary Crossing Feasibility Study was moving forward, and that the consultant team was in the process of finalizing the concepts. Two community meetings will be held in October: one in Alameda and one in Oakland. Short-, medium- and long-term solutions for crossings at the west end would be discussed. The final recommendations will be brought to the Transportation Commission.

b. **Broadway/Jackson**

Staff Khan noted that the Project Study Report has been submitted to Caltrans. The proposal includes improving the 6th Street corridor in Oakland. He noted that the environmental phase would be the next step.

c. **Monitoring of Oak Street/Central Avenue**

Staff Khan noted that City Council directed staff to conduct traffic monitoring at the Oak/Central intersection, and that the 90-day monitoring was completed at the end of August. Staff will present the findings to the Transportation Commission at the October meeting.

d. **Future Projects**

In response to an inquiry by *Commissioner Schatmeier* about any assessment of the traffic impacts of the bike path adjacent to Fernside Blvd., *Staff Khan* replied that it was too new to assess. *Commissioner Schatmeier* suggested that additional signage for southbound bicyclists on Fernside would be helpful to direct riders to the bridge. *Chair Knox White* suggested a stencil. *Staff Khan* said that there is a concern about installing too many signs, but that a stencil may be appropriate.

Chair Knox White noted that the TMP EIR will go to the Planning Board at the end of November, and City Council in December. He noted that there would be time during the Transportation Commission's November meeting to make further comments. He inquired whether it would be possible to move the meeting to the second Wednesday in November. The Transportation Commission concurred.

9. **ADJOURNMENT:** 8:55 p.m.